

Predrag Komatina

## The “king of Francia” in *De cerimoniis* II, 48

**Abstract:** In what is known as the *List of addresses to the foreign rulers of De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae* (II, 48) by Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913–959), there is an address to a ruler called “king of Francia”. This paper is devoted to an attempt to find the answer to the question of who this “king of Francia” might have been. Judging from the fact that in that address both the Roman emperors and the ruler it concerns are given very exalted epithets, the address to the “king of Francia” designates a ruler who was, for various reasons, considered by the imperial chancery more distinguished and more important than other rulers of Western Europe. Current opinion holds that the ruler in question was Otto I and that the address reflects the then prevailing view in Constantinople of Otto as the most serious candidate for the crown of the Western Empire. According to the research of Constantine Zuckerman, the *List of addresses*, along with other “diplomatic chapters” of the *Book of Ceremonies*, was composed in 946. In September 944 the marriage was concluded between Romanus II, the son of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, and Bertha, natural daughter of Hugh, then king of Italy. Describing that event, contemporary Byzantine writers refer to Hugh as the “king of Francia”. This paper examines the possibility of linking this “king of Francia” with the one in the *List of addresses*, on the basis of information concerning King Hugh in another work by emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus – *De administrando imperio*.

---

**Adresse:** Predrag Komatina, Institute for Byzantine Studies of the Serbian Academy of Sciences, Belgrade; pedjakomatina@gmail.com

In what is known as the *List of addresses to foreign rulers of De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae* (II, 48) by Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913–959), there is a passage which contains addresses to the rulers of those Western European countries

---

The paper contains part of the results of the work on the Project “Tradition, Innovation and Identity in the Byzantine World” (no. 177032), supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Government of the Republic of Serbia. Special thanks to Prof. Miloš Antonović of the University of Belgrade – Faculty of Philosophy, Department of History, for his generous help.

that were in the political orbit of the former Frankish Empire. In that passage the following is stated:

To the king of Saxony, king of Bavaria (that is the country which is called Nemitzoi), king of Gaul, king of Germania. Inscription to all of them: In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, the One and the Only True God of ours, Constantine and Romanus, faithful to the same God Emperors of the Romans, to the most respected spiritual brother, the most distinguished king (τὸν πεποθημένον πνευματικὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν περιβλεπτον ῥῆγα).<sup>1</sup>

However, besides that passage which clearly deals with the territory of the Frankish political sphere, the same *List of addresses* contains another address to a ruler of the same area, who is explicitly called *king of Francia*. That address reads as follows:

To the king of Francia (εἰς τὸν ῥῆγα Φραγγίας). Golden bull. In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, the One and the Only True God of ours, Constantine and Romanus, faithful to the same God sublime augusti, autocrats, great Emperors of the Romans, to the beloved, the most respected and spiritual brother of ours (name), the most noble and the most distinguished king of Francia (τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ, πεποθημένῳ καὶ πνευματικῷ ἡμῶν ἀδελφῷ ὁ δεῖνα τῷ εὐγενεστάτῳ περιβλεπτῷ ῥηγὶ Φραγγίας).<sup>2</sup>

We will concentrate our attention on this last address and devote this paper to an attempt to find the answer to the question of who this *king of Francia* might have been. What is clear at first sight is that, judging from the fact that it is detached from the passage concerning other rulers of the Frankish political orbit and that in it both the Roman emperors and the ruler it concerns are given far more exalted epithets, the address to the *king of Francia* designates the ruler who was, for various reasons, considered by the imperial chancery to be more distinguished and more important than other rulers of Western Europe.<sup>3</sup> Researchers have tended to identify that ruler, that *king of Francia*, at first with the duke of the Ger-

1 *De cerimoniis* II, 48 (Constantinus Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae*, ed. J.J. REISKE. Bonnae 1829) 689.4–12 (all translations are mine except where otherwise noted); this passage is preceded by the one concerning the pope of Rome, *ibid.* 688.22–689.4, and followed by the one with the address to the “prince of Rome”, *ibid.* 689.12–14.

2 *De cerimoniis* II, 48 (ed. REISKE) 691.13–20; this passage is preceded by the one with the addresses to the rulers of the South Slavs, *ibid.* 691.8–13, and followed by the addresses to the “supreme lord of India” and the “lord of Arabia Felix”, *ibid.* 691.20–692.2, with which the *List of addresses* ends.

3 Cf. J.-M. MARTIN, *L'Occident chrétien dans le Livre des cérémonies*, II, 48, in G. Dagron (ed.), *Byzance et ses voisins. Études sur certains passages du Livre des cérémonies*, II, 15 et 46–48. *TM* 13 (2000) 642–643.

man province of Franconia,<sup>4</sup> then with the king of Western Francia (later France),<sup>5</sup> or the king of Eastern Francia (later Germany), in this particular case Otto I the Great (936–973, emperor from 962).<sup>6</sup> Current opinion holds that the ruler in question was Otto I and that the address reflects the then prevailing view in Constantinople of Otto, the king of Eastern Francia from 936 and of Italy from 951, as the potential and most serious candidate for the crown of the Western Empire, that is, “the true, but still uncrowned emperor”, and that it most probably dates from 952 or a bit later.<sup>7</sup>

Since the address was composed in the name of the emperors Constantine and Romanus, who can only be Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus and his son Romanus II, it is quite clear that it must have been composed after Romanus II was crowned co-emperor with his father on March 22, 946. According to the reliable research of Constantine ZUCKERMAN, which was part of the work of a group of researchers in Paris dealing with the “diplomatic chapters” of the *Book of Ceremonies* (chapters II, 15, 46–48), the *List of addresses*, along with other “diplomatic chapters”, was composed in 946, precisely during several months between the coronation of Romanus II on March 22, and the reception of the envoys of the caliph of Cordoba Abd-ar-Rahman III (912–961) in Constantinople on October 24 of the same year.<sup>8</sup> That time frame may also help us to determine the identity of the enigmatic *king of Francia* of the *List of addresses*.

As is well known, in September 944, at the initiative of the emperor Romanus I Lacapenus (920–944), Porphyrogenitus’ father-in-law, the marriage was concluded between Porphyrogenitus’ son and Lacapenus’ grandson, Romanus (II) the Younger, and Bertha, natural daughter of Hugh (926–947), then king of

4 A. RAMBAUD, *L’empire grec au dixième siècle. Constantin Porphyrogénète*. Paris 1870, 308.

5 O. MEYER, Εἰς τὸν ῥῆγα Σαζωνίας, in: *Festschrift Albert Brackmann*. Weimar 1931, 130–131; F. DÖLGER, Otto Meyer, Εἰς τὸν ῥῆγα Σαζωνίας, *Brackmann-Festschrift* (1931) 123–136 (bibliographische Notiz). *BZ* 31 (1931) 442.

6 W. OHNSORGE, *Drei Deperdita der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei und die Frankenadressen im Zeremonienbuch des Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos*, in W. Ohnsorge (ed.), *Abendland und Byzanz*. Darmstadt 1958, 227–254.

7 MARTIN (as footnote 3 above) 641–643.

8 C. ZUCKERMAN, *La voyage d’Olga et la première ambassade espagnole à Constantinople en 946*, in Dagron, *Byzance et ses voisins* (as footnote 3 above) 669–672. On older opinions on the character and dating of the *List of addresses*, cf. G. OSTROGORSKY, *Die byzantinische Staatenhierarchie*. *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 8 (1936) 49–53; F. DÖLGER, *Die “Familie der Könige” im Mittelalter*. *Historisches Jahrbuch* 26 (1940) 397–420; J. FERLUGA, *Lista adresa za strane vladare iz Knjige o ceremonijama*. *ZRVI* 12 (1970) 157–178.

Italy.<sup>9</sup> Describing that event, contemporary writers, such as Symeon Magister and Logothete and the so-called *Continuator of Theophanes* and *Continuator of George the Monk*, refer to Hugh as the *King of Francia*: “On the second indiction the emperor Romanus (I) sent Paschalius, protospatharius and strategos of Langobardia, to Hugh, the king of Francia (πρὸς τὸν ῥῆγα Φραγγίας Οὐγγωνα), asking for his daughter as bride to Romanus, the son of Constantine, his son-in-law. The same Paschalius, having taken her, conducted her to Constantinople with great wealth. The marriage was concluded in September of the third indiction. Having lived with her husband for five years, she passed away during the days of self-rule of Constantine, her father-in-law.”<sup>10</sup>

Is there any possibility to link this *king of Francia* to the one in the *List of addresses*?

Certain arguments supporting this thesis can be found in another famous work of emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus – *De administrando imperio*. First, we should consider the epithets used by Porphyrogenitus for King Hugh in that work. Chapter 26 of the *DAI* is titled *The genealogy of the most distinguished King Hugh* (Ἡ γενεαλογία τοῦ περιβλέπτου ῥηγὸς Οὐγγωνος), and at the beginning of that chapter, as well as further on in the chapter, he is also called “the most distinguished King Hugh (τοῦ περιβλέπτου ῥηγὸς Οὐγγωνος).”<sup>11</sup> At one point in the chapter it says: “Hugh, son of Taliafern and Boso and Hugh, the brother of Boso, the aforementioned most noble king (ὁ προρρηθεὶς εὐγενέστατος ῥῆξ).”<sup>12</sup> As can be seen, the epithets that Porphyrogenitus uses for King Hugh at those places, “the most distinguished” (περιβλεπτος) and “the most noble” (εὐγενέστατος), are exactly those that, according to the *List of addresses*, should accompany the name of the *king of Francia* in letters that are destined to him: “to

<sup>9</sup> On the marriage of Romanus II and Bertha, cf. Liutprandi Antapodosis (Liutprand von Cremona, *Die Werke*, ed. J. BECKER. *MGH SS rer. Germ.*, 41. Hannover/Leipzig 1915) 137.8–28, 141.16–32; *DAI* (Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*, ed. G. MORAVCSIK / R.J.H. JENKINS. *CFHB*, 1. Washington, DC 1967) c. 26.66–72; Symeon Magister (Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon, ed. S. WAHLGREN. *CFHB*, 44/1. Berolini/Novi Eboraci 2006) c. 136.78; Theophanes Continuatus (Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus, ed. I. BEKKER. Bonn 1838) 431.11–19; Georgius Monachus (ibid.) 917.11–18; S. RUNCIMAN, *The Emperor Romanus Lacapenus and his reign*. Cambridge 1929, 195–196; R. HIESTAND, *Byzanz und das Regnum Italicum im 10. Jahrhundert*. Zürich 1964, 181–187; J. SHEPARD, *Byzantium and the West*, in T. Reuter (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History III* (c. 900 – c. 1024). Cambridge 1999, 609–610.

<sup>10</sup> Symeon Magister, c. 136.78; Theophanes Continuatus, 431.11–19; Georgius Monachus, 917.11–18.

<sup>11</sup> *DAI*, c. 26.1, 3, 68–69.

<sup>12</sup> *DAI*, c. 26.43–45.

the most noble and the most distinguished king of Francia (τῷ εὐγενεστάτῳ περιβλέπτῳ ῥηγὶ Φραγγίας)."

Another thing that we should note in the *DAI* would be those places at which Porphyrogenitus mentions the marriages between the Romans and the Franks. The above-mentioned marriage between his son Romanus II and Hugh's daughter Bertha, renamed Eudocia in Constantinople, is described by Porphyrogenitus at the end of the same Chapter 26.<sup>13</sup> However, before that, in Chapter 13, titled *On the nations bordering the Turks* (i.e. Hungarians), there is a story according to which the first Christian emperor, Constantine the Great, issued a law "that never shall an emperor of the Romans ally himself in marriage with a nation of customs differing from and alien to those of the Roman order, especially with one that is infidel and unbaptized." The only exception to that rule were the Franks, "for there is much relationship and converse between Franks and Romans. And why did he order that with them alone could the emperors of the Romans intermarry? Because of the traditional fame and nobility of those lands and races ..." <sup>14</sup> Keeping in mind the marriage between his son Romanus and Hugh's daughter Bertha in 944, one gets the impression from the passage just cited from Chapter 13 of the *DAI*, composed between 948 and 952<sup>15</sup> – that the Franks alone of the foreign peoples are worthy of the honor of allying themselves in marriage with the emperors of the Romans – that he is trying to justify the marriage of his son before the Constantinopolitan public, unaccustomed to their emperors establishing bonds of kinship with foreign rulers. In any case, those lines surely testify that Porphyrogenitus and his Roman subjects considered Hugh, the king of Italy, a Frank and a Frankish king.

But why would Porphyrogenitus and his contemporaries call Hugh, the king of Italy, *king of Francia*? There is no doubt that they were well aware that he ruled over Italy. In another chapter of the *Book of Ceremonies* there is information on the alliance in 935 between the emperor Romanus I Lacapenus and the *king of Italy* (τὸν ῥῆγα Ἰταλίας), at that time Hugh, against the Lombard princes of Benevento, Capua and Salerno in South Italy,<sup>16</sup> while Porphyrogenitus ex-

<sup>13</sup> *DAI*, c. 26.66–72.

<sup>14</sup> *DAI*, c. 13.107–126, transl. by R.J.H. JENKINS, 71–73. See also D. NICOL, The Byzantine view of western Europe. *GRBS* 8 (1967) 321–323.

<sup>15</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*. Commentary, ed. R.J.H. JENKINS. London 1962, 5–8, 63.

<sup>16</sup> *De cerimoniis*, II, 44 (ed. REISKE) 661; J. HALDON, Theory and practice in tenth-century military administration: Chapters II, 44 and 45 of the *Book of Ceremonies*. *TM* 13 (2000) 215, 243; HIESTAND, Byzanz (as footnote 9 above) 171–177.

plicitly says that Hugh's son Lothair II (946–950) “is now (i. e. at the time of writing Chapter 26 of the *DAI*) king of Italy”.<sup>17</sup>

For Porphyrogenitus himself, as can be seen from his writings, above all the *De administrando imperio*, *Francia* (Φραγγία) was a term denoting the entire territory under the former political domination of the Carolingians.<sup>18</sup> Firstly, *Francia* was a country situated on the western borders of the ancient northern homeland of the Serbs and Croats,<sup>19</sup> and of the country populated in the mid-10<sup>th</sup> century by the Hungarians.<sup>20</sup> Then, it was the country situated “between Croatia and Venetia (μεταξύ Χρωβατίας καὶ Βενετίας),”<sup>21</sup> and in which Aquileia and other cities were situated, whose inhabitants were *Franks* (... Φράγγοι ἀπὸ Ἀκουῖλεγίας καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐτέρων τόπων τῆς Φραγγίας, ... πάντες οἱ Φράγγοι ἀπὸ Ἀκουῖλεγίας καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐτέρων τῆς Φραγγίας κάστρων).<sup>22</sup> Thus, it is clear that for Porphyrogenitus Italy was also a part of *Francia*.<sup>23</sup>

Porphyrogenitus was, however, also aware of the political pluralism which characterized the Franks. At one place he writes that “Attila, the emperor of the Avars, came and utterly devastated all the Francias (πάσας τὰς Φραγγίας καταληϊσμένους),” and a bit further that “king Pippin, who was at that time ruling over Pavia and other *rhegata*,” that is *kingdoms*, “had three brothers who ruled over all the Francias and Sklavenias (Πιπίνος ὁ ῥήξ, ὃς ἦρχε τότε τῆς τε Παπίας καὶ ἐτέρων ῥηγάτων; Εἶχεν γὰρ οὗτος ὁ Πιπίνος ἀδελφούς τρεῖς, οἵτινες

<sup>17</sup> *DAI*, c. 26.65–66. It has long been noticed that an address to the *king of Italy* is missing in the *List of addresses* of the *Book of Ceremonies*, see RAMBAUD (as footnote 4 above) 308; MEYER (as footnote 5 above) 125. DÖLGER, Otto Meyer (as footnote 5 above) 441–442, tried to explain the fact by assuming that the phrase “εἰς τὸν ῥῆγα Γαλλίας” from the first group of the addresses to the rulers of Western Europe, *De ceremoniis*, II, 48 (ed. REISKE) 689.6, was in fact a corruption of “εἰς τὸν ῥῆγα Ἰταλίας”, caused by a scribal error.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *De administrando imperio*. Commentary (as footnote 15 above) 92.

<sup>19</sup> *DAI*, c. 30.72, 74, 85, 31.5, 32.5.

<sup>20</sup> *DAI*, c. 13.4, 40.44.

<sup>21</sup> *DAI*, c. 31.44–45.

<sup>22</sup> *DAI*, c. 28.4–5, 8–9.

<sup>23</sup> OHNSORGE, *Drei Deperdita* (as footnote 6 above) 241–244, neglected places at which Porphyrogenitus uses the term *Francia* for the areas outside Italy, thus reaching the incorrect conclusion that Porphyrogenitus' *Francia* was in fact Italy. On the other hand, another of his conclusions (*ibid.* 241–242) is certainly right – that Porphyrogenitus' phrase Μεγάλη Φραγγία, *DAI*, c. 26.5–6, 16–18, 29.133–135, which, in my opinion, should be translated rather as *Old Francia* then as *Great Francia*, correspond to what was considered *Francia* in the West of that time – the area north and west of the Alps, cf. Notker Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli Magni imperatoris*, c. 1.10, ed. H. HAEFELE. *MGH SS rer. Germ. N. S.*, 12. Berolini 1959, 13.

ἤρχον πασῶν τῶν Φραγγιῶν καὶ Σκλαβηγιῶν).”<sup>24</sup> While Pippin was said to have ruled “over Pavia and other *rhegata*,”<sup>25</sup> Charlemagne, who “became emperor in Old Francia, was the sole ruler over all the *rhegata* (Οὗτος οὖν ὁ Κάρουλος ἦν μονοκράτωρ πάντων τῶν ῥηγάτων),” and in his days “none of the subordinated kings dared call himself a king (οὐδεὶς τῶν ὑπολοίπων ῥηγῶν ἐτόλμησε ῥῆγα ἑαυτὸν καλέσαι), but they all were his vassals.”<sup>26</sup> So, the *Francia* that Porphyrogenitus knew was not a single political entity, but was composed of several parts, which he called *rhegata*, that is *kingdoms* (τὰ ῥηγᾶτα), and that explains why he at certain points in his text used the plural form *Francias* (αἱ Φραγγαίαι), similar to the term *Sklavenias* (αἱ Σκλαβηγίαι). One of those *rhegata* was Italy, often mentioned by Porphyrogenitus as the *rhegaton of Italy* or the *rhegaton of Pavia* (after the royal capital), or the *rhegaton of Italy, that is, of Pavia* (τὸ ῥηγᾶτον Ἰταλίας, ἥτοι Παπίας).<sup>27</sup>

Nevertheless, it is evident from his narrative that Porphyrogenitus also knew of the existence of some kind of supreme authority on the level of *Francia* as a whole, above the individual *rhegata*. According to his words, Charlemagne “was the sole ruler over all the *rhegata*” and “none of the subordinated kings dared call himself a king, but they all were his vassals.”<sup>28</sup> After him, the *Elder Lothair*, according to Porphyrogenitus “grandfather of the most distinguished king Hugh”, who was “from the family of Charlemagne”, was a *king of Italy*,<sup>29</sup> that is, the ruler of the *rhegaton of Italy*, but he also got to Rome, where he “was crowned by the then pope (καὶ ἐστέφθη παρὰ τοῦ τότε πάπα),” after which he went back “to his dominion, that is, to Pavia (εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐξουσίαν, ἥγουν εἰς Παπίαν),” but died on his way in Piacenza.<sup>30</sup> After him, “Louis, kinsman of Louis,” came from *Old Francia* and assumed rule in Papia, but he “was not crowned.”<sup>31</sup> After he had been blinded, power was seized by Berengar, “who entered Rome and was crowned.”<sup>32</sup>

24 DAI, c. 28.6–7, 17–19.

25 DAI, c. 26.17–18.

26 DAI, c. 26.5–8.

27 DAI, c. 26.2, 12–13, 18, 25–26, 41–43, 54–56, 65–66, 27.10–11, 15–17, 48, 28.18, 41.

Another *rhegaton*, or another *Francia* that Porphyrogenitus mentions would certainly be Burgundy (Βεργώνια), DAI, c. 26.24–26, 42, 57–64.

28 DAI, c. 26.5–8.

29 DAI, c. 26.2–5.

30 DAI, c. 26.10–14.

31 DAI, c. 26.16–19.

32 DAI, c. 26.19–23.



We can conclude from these passages that for Porphyrogenitus what made someone an heir to Charlemagne in supreme authority, that is, *sole rulership* (μονοκρατία) over *all the rhegata of Francia* and gave him legitimacy, was the *coronation in Rome*. It is quite clear that the coronation in question was the coronation with the *imperial crown*, with which popes in Rome, starting with the coronation of Charlmagne in the year 800, used to crown his heirs and descendants *emperors of the Romans*. There were among them indeed all those mentioned by Porphyrogenitus – Lothair I (840–855),<sup>33</sup> Louis II (855–875), Berengar I (915–924), even Louis III (901–905), who Porphyrogenitus erroneously states was not crowned.<sup>34</sup> Thus, Porphyrogenitus in these passages relates the history of the western *emperors of the Romans*. However, he, who was the *emperor of the Romans* himself, could not recognize that title of the Frankish rulers.<sup>35</sup> He recognizes the fact of their coronation in Rome, but despite that, for him they were just

---

**33** When he speaks of the *Elder Lothair*, the grandfather of King Hugh, Porphyrogenitus combines into one person two different persons called Lothair, a father and a son, Lothair I (840–855), who was the king of Italy and who was crowned emperor by the pope in Rome, and Lothar II (855–869), who was not king of Italy, but of Middle Francia (Lotharingia), and who was never crowned emperor in Rome, but who was the grandfather of King Hugh and who did die in Piacenza, on August 8, 869, on his way back from Rome, where he had gone, not for political reasons, but seeking a solution for the issue of his marriages, cf. *De administrando imperio*. Commentary (as footnote 15 above) 83–85; J. FRIED, *The Frankish kingdoms, 817–911: the East and Middle kingdoms*, in: *The New Cambridge Medieval History II* (c. 700 – c. 900), ed. R. McKITTERICK. Cambridge 1995, 149–150.

**34** General survey of the history of the Carolingians and western emperors from the coronation of Charlemagne to Berengar I, cf. *The New Cambridge Medieval History II* (as footnote 33 above) 105–168, 303–319; *ibid.* III (as footnote 9 above) 346–349. On the rulers of Italy, their imperial pretensions and relations with Byzantium after the death of Louis II in 875, cf. HIESTAND, *Byzanz* (as footnote 9 above).

**35** According to the Treaty of Aachen of 812, the then emperor Michael I (811–813) recognized the title of emperor by Charlemagne, though not that of the *emperor of the Romans*, but instead that of the *emperor of the Franks* (βασιλεὺς τῶν Φράγγων): Theophanis *Chronographia*, ed. C. DE BOOR. Lipsiae 1883, 494.20–24. However, already emperor Michael II (820–829) in his letter from 824 calls Charles' son Louis I the Pious (814–840) the “king of the Franks and Lombards, the so-called emperor of theirs”: *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. J.D. MANSI. Florentiae/Venetis 1759–1798, XIV, 417 AB. Nevertheless, the prevailing scholarly view has been that the Byzantine emperors recognized the title of the *emperor of the Franks* by the Western emperors until 871 and an ideological clash between Basil I and Louis II, and afterwards only the title of *king*, cf. W. OHNSORGE, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter*. Hildesheim 1947, 15–43; *De administrando imperio*. Commentary (as footnote 15 above) 83, 85; HIESTAND, *Byzanz* (as footnote 9 above) 15–19; NICOL, *Byzantine view* (as footnote 14 above) 320–321.



kings,<sup>36</sup> different from other *kings* of the individual Frankish *rhegata* and elevated above them only by the fact that they had been crowned in Rome.

However, when he speaks of those *crowned kings* of the Franks, Porphyrogenitus never once uses the title of *king of Francia* for them. The only ruler referred to by Porphyrogenitus explicitly as the *king of Francia* (ῥῆξ Φραγγίας) in the *De administrando imperio*, although at another place, in Chapter 29, was Louis II (855–875),<sup>37</sup> whom he mentions in the cited passage about the heirs to Charlemagne in connection with “Louis who came from Old Francia,” that is, Louis III, who was his grandson. Louis II, who ruled directly only over Italy, was crowned and for the Westerners undisputed *emperor of the Romans*.<sup>38</sup> Yet for Porphyrogenitus he was equally undoubtedly the *king of Francia*.<sup>39</sup> Given Porphyrogenitus’ view of *Francia* as the entire area under the former political domination of the Carolingians and his understanding that the Frankish ruler who was crowned in Rome, as was Louis II, was the supreme ruler of all of that area, it is quite clear that in the case of Louis II Porphyrogenitus’ phrase *king of Francia* wholly corresponds to the title of the *emperor of the Romans*, attributed to Louis II in the West.<sup>40</sup>

Could it be that Constantine Porphyrogenitus also considered Hugh of Arles *king of Francia* in this manner? Like Louis II, Hugh ruled only over Italy. Nevertheless,

---

**36** Although he calls Charlemagne “the sole ruler over all the *rhegata*,” Porphyrogenitus then adds that in his days “none of the subordinated kings dared call himself a king, but they all were his vassals,” DAI, c. 26.6–8. From these lines it is clear that for Porphyrogenitus Charlemagne, even as the supreme lord over all the Frankish *kings*, only carried the title of *king* (ῥῆξ). On the problem of the meaning of terms ῥῆξ and ῥηγᾶτα in Porphyrogenitus’ work, see also OHNSORGE, *Drei Deperdita* (as footnote 6 above) 242–246.

**37** DAI, c. 29.103 sq.

**38** On the emperor Louis II in general, cf. P. DELOGU, *Lombard and Carolingian Italy*, in: *The New Cambridge Medieval History II* (as footnote 33 above) 310–314.

**39** Louis II is called *king of Francia* also in other works of Porphyrogenitus – the *Vita Basilii* and *De Thematibus*, cf. *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur liber quo Vita Basilii imperatoris amplectitur*, ed. I. ŠEVČENKO. *CFHB*, 42. Berolini 2011, c. 55.19 sq; Costantino Porfirogenito, *De thematibus*, ed. A. PERTUSI. Roma 1952, c. 11.35 sq. – It is well known that Porphyrogenitus’ grandfather, emperor Basil I (867–886), in his letter concerning the joint military expedition in South Italy and against the then Muslim city of Bari in 871, fiercely disputed the claim of Louis II to the imperial title, which Louis II then vigorously defended in his answer to that letter from the Summer of 871, cf. *Epistola Ludovici imperatoris ad Basilium*, in: *Chronicon Salernitanum*, ed. G.H. PERTZ. *MGH SS*, 3. Hannoverae 1839, 521.22–524.51; OHNSORGE, *Zweikaiserproblem* (as footnote 35 above) 40–45.

**40** According to OHNSORGE, *Drei Deperdita* (as footnote 6 above) 238–241, “Der König von Italien ist als Inhaber des abendländischen Kaisertums der ῥῆξ Φραγγίας.”

between the two there was a crucial difference – unlike Louis II, who was crowned emperor, Hugh was never crowned in Rome with the imperial crown.<sup>41</sup> According to Porphyrogenitus, King Hugh was the direct descendant of Charlemagne through the male line – he was, allegedly, son of Adalbert, the son of the *Elder Lothair*, who “came from the family of Charlemagne.”<sup>42</sup> Chapter 26 of the *De administrando imperio*, titled *The Genealogy of the most distinguished King Hugh*, begins with praise for his ancestors Charles and Lothair,<sup>43</sup> and ends with a report about how Hugh took over power in the *rhegaton* of Italy,<sup>44</sup> which is presented by Porphyrogenitus as the return of the lawful heir to the possession of his forefathers, after the reign of a series of kings, some of which were even *crowned in Rome*, as stated above, but whose right to rule, according to Porphyrogenitus, was not based on as a solid foundation as Hugh’s.<sup>45</sup> At the very end of the chapter, Porphyrogenitus highlights the fact of the marriage between Hugh’s daughter Bertha and his son and heir Romanus II.<sup>46</sup>

---

**41** Although he was king of Italy and in that respect somehow destined to claim the imperial crown, his most serious effort at accomplishing that ended in 932 without success. He managed to enter Rome and marry Marozia, a representative of the most powerful patrician family of Rome of that time, the Theophylacti, that dominated the political life of the Eternal City in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, but, nevertheless, he was forced to leave the city when he faced the opposition of Alberic, Marozia’s son from her first marriage. Alberic then established his own rule in Rome and ruled it independently for the next twenty-two years (932–954), as the *prince of the Romans* (*princeps Romanorum*). However, Hugh never totally abandoned his aspirations towards the imperial crown, and his political influence always exceeded the narrow boundaries of the Kingdom of Italy. His influence was especially felt in Provence, which he had ruled before he became king of Italy in 926, and for a certain period of time also in Upper Burgundy, when he, after the death of King Rudolf II in 937, married his widow Bertha, betrothed Rudolf’s daughter Adelaide to his own son Lothair and became tutor of Rudolf’s infant son, King Conrad (937–993). On King Hugh, his politics and ideology and the conditions in Italy during his reign, cf. C.W. PREVITÉ ORTON, Italy and Provence, 900–950. *English Historical Review* 32/127 (1917) 341–347; HIE- STAND, Byzanz (as footnote 9 above) 156–193; C.B. BOUCHARD, Burgundy and Provence, 879–1032, in: *The New Cambridge Medieval History III* (as footnote 9 above) 340–341; G. SERGI, The Kingdom of Italy, *ibid.* 351–355; MARTIN (as footnote 3 above) 638–639. For the most recent review of Hugh’s internal policy, cf. G. VIGNODELLI, Berta e Adelaide: la politica di consolidamento del potere regio di Ugo di Arles, in T. Lazzari (a cura di), *Il patrimonio delle regine: beni del fisco e politica regia tra IX e X secolo. Reti Medievali Rivista* 13/2 (2012) 247–294.

**42** DAI, c. 26.1–4, 10–16.

**43** DAI, c. 26.2–16.

**44** DAI, c. 26.56–59.

**45** DAI, c. 26.16–56.

**46** DAI, c. 26.66–72.

Porphyrogenitus was well aware that Hugh was not crowned in Rome and that he thus didn't meet that formal requirement to be recognized as the supreme ruler over the Franks as had other rulers he mentions in the first part of his story on Hugh. However, Porphyrogenitus obviously considered Hugh the rightful heir to the authority of Charlemagne and Lothair I, not only in the *rhegaton* of Italy, but also as the supreme power over all the Franks. The fact that he was wrong in presenting Hugh as the direct descendant of Charlemagne and Lothair I in the male line,<sup>47</sup> in my opinion is not due to a mistake in his interpretation of his sources, but to his intention to exalt as far as possible the origins of his daughter-in-law's father.<sup>48</sup> Thus, although he was not crowned in Rome, King Hugh, according to Porphyrogenitus, possessed all the preconditions to be considered *king of Francia* in Constantinople, and Porphyrogenitus himself had additional political and personal motives to treat him as such.

Considering all the arguments set out so far:

1. that the same epithets used for the *king of Francia* in the *List of addresses* (*the most noble, the most distinguished*) are used by Porphyrogenitus in Chapter 26 of the *De administrando imperio* for Hugh, the king of Italy;
2. that Porphyrogenitus' insistence in Chapter 13 of the *DAI* that of all nations only the Franks are worthy of intermarriage with the emperors of the Romans is a clear allusion to the marriage of his son Romanus II and Hugh's daughter Bertha, concluded in September 944;
3. that for Porphyrogenitus Italy, which was directly ruled by Hugh, was also part of *Francia*;
4. that in Chapter 26 of the *DAI* he presents King Hugh as the direct descendant through the male line and the true heir to the power and authority of Charlemagne and Lothair I,

it can be concluded that the formulation “... to the most noble and the most distinguished king of Francia (τῷ εὐγενεστάτῳ περιβλέπτῳ ῥηγὶ Φραγγίας)” in the *List of addresses* from 946, composed in the imperial chancery of Constantine

---

**47** Hugh was a descendant of Charlemagne through the female line – his mother Bertha († 925), whose first husband was Hugh's father, count Theobald of Arles († 895), and second husband, thus Hugh's stepfather, margrave Adalbert II of Tuscany († 915), was a daughter of Lothair II (855–869), king of Middle Francia (Lotharingia), who in turn was the son of the emperor Lothair I (840–855), grandson of Louis I the Pious (814–840) and great-grandson of Charlemagne (768–814), cf. inter alia, PREVITÉ ORTON, Italy (as footnote 41 above) 337 sq. and genealogical tables in *De administrando imperio*. Commentary (as footnote 15 above) 84; HIESTAND (as footnote 9 above) 182–184; The New Cambridge Medieval History III (as footnote 9) 702.

**48** For both views, cf. *De administrando imperio*. Commentary (as footnote 15 above) 83–85.

VII Porphyrogenitus and Romanus II, refers to the then king of Italy Hugh (926–947). The fact that he was forced to leave Italy that same year, leaving the throne to his son Lothair II (946–950), and retreat to Provence, does not diminish the validity of this conclusion, for Hugh formally kept his title and authority up until his death on April 10, 947.<sup>49</sup> This conclusion could also explain in the best way the omission of the address to the *king of Italy* in the *List of addresses*.

---

<sup>49</sup> Liutprandi Antapodosis, 149.21–34; Hiestand, Byzanz (as footnote 9 above) 194–198; Sergi, Kingdom (as footnote 41 above) 354–355.